



THE SPANISH REVOLUTION.

FURTHER PARTICULARS OF THE MOVEMENT.

Don Alfonso's view of the duty he has to perform—the active part of the Captain-General of Madrid—the policy toward Cuba—submission of a prominent Carlist leader to the new Government.

LONDON, Friday, Jan. 1, 1875. In his interview with the Paris correspondent of the *London Times*, Don Alfonso said: "Liberal Constitutionalism as I am, I know well that it is not a matter of pleasure to be King of Spain at this moment, but I shall try to understand my duty and do it."

A special dispatch from Madrid to the *London Times* says Gen. Primo de Rivera some time ago informed Marshal Serrano that he intended to have Alfonso proclaimed King, and persisted in this intention despite the offers of Serrano to him of the most elevated positions in his gift, including that of Captain-General of Cuba. Marshal Serrano was unable to supersede Rivera, as he alone had the disposal of the military forces in Madrid.

The *Times*'s correspondent also says that the new Ministry has telegraphed the Captain-General of Cuba, ordering him to announce the proclamation of King Alfonso to the army in Cuba, which the King trusts will more determinedly than ever defend the integrity of the Spanish territory.

Disturbances are apprehended at Barcelona. A special dispatch to the *Times* says the report published in a Carlist paper of the death of the Spanish statesman Espartero is without foundation.

MADRID, Friday, Jan. 1, 1875. The Republican armies in Catalonia and Saragosa have accepted Don Alfonso as King.

It is reported that one of the first acts of the new Ministry will be to telegraph to the Captain-General of Cuba to exercise a conciliatory spirit and to pacify the Cubans by reestablishing, as far as possible, a cordial understanding between the Home and Provincial Governments and the creoles.

The Spanish army and navy yesterday everywhere accepted Don Alfonso as King. Marshal Serrano has quietly transferred the command of the army to Gen. Laserna.

PARIS, Friday, Jan. 1, 1875. Despatches from Spain say that Gen. Doreygarra has laid down his arms, and that other prominent Carlist leaders are about to give in their adhesion to Don Alfonso.

The Spanish Ambassador at Paris has resigned. The Duke de Montpensier and the Orleans princes have congratulated Don Alfonso upon his accession to the Spanish throne.

THE NEWS AT WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 1.—The State Department has telegrams confirmatory generally of the fact of the revolution in Spain. There is nothing in them at variance with the accounts already published in the newspapers.

PROCLAMATION BY CAPTAIN-GENERAL CONCHA.

HAVANA, Jan. 1.—Captain-General Concha has issued a proclamation announcing the accession of Prince Alfonso to the Spanish Crown. The Captain-General held an official reception at the palace this afternoon.

THE SPANISH RESIDENTS PLEASED.

THE RESULT ANTICIPATED—CAUSES WHICH HASTENED IT—SPAIN STRONG AGAIN, AND WILL RESIST TO NO INTRUSION FROM OTHER POWERS. José Ferrer de Concha, in conversation with a *Times* correspondent, said that the revolution in Spain was the result of many causes. What was coming was in the knowledge of all Spain, including the Government officers, and intimations of the event were heard on all sides. He was in Madrid a few weeks ago, and had only recently returned. While there he had heard the coronation of Don Alfonso talked of in all quarters, even in the President's palace. The change was acceptable to the army, the navy, and to every class of Spaniards. When asked if he supposed it would have any effect on the relations of the United States and Spain, he answered that possibly the relations would become more cordial, but only if the American Government would refrain from any interference in the internal affairs of Spain, and if the United States would now have a serious Government, that would consent to no interference in its affairs from any foreign force.

He knew most of the new Ministers. He presumed the one named as Minister of Justice was Alonso de Lara y Cordova, who was formerly Intendant of Cuba under Queen Isabella. Alonso de Castro, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, had been formerly American Minister of the Colonies. Jovellar, American known, was the Captain-General of Cuba at the time of the Virginia affair. Don Pedro de Salazar was in the O'Donnell Ministry. The Marquis de Meana was a Minister of the Navy Department in the reign of Queen Isabella. Romero Robledo was a young man who, in the revolution, was Minister of the Colonies. Manuel Orovio had also been in the last Cabinet of Queen Isabella, and Adelardo Lopez de Ayala had been twice Minister of the Colonies. The great bulk of the Spaniards in this city were well satisfied with the change.

Arthur Cuyas, a Spanish journalist, stated that to those acquainted with Spanish politics the general drift to the present result was evident some time ago. Spain needed a strong Government; she was not suited to a republic, not one with settled habits and ancient traditions. There was only one of two issues to the situation possible, Carlist or Alfonsoism, and Alfonsoism was the natural one. One side of the change would be that the Carlist war would soon be subdued, and thus the Spanish forces would be free for action in Cuba. He thought as a general thing the Spaniards in New-York would consider the news as a splendid New Year's present. The Ministry, so far as he knew its members, was a strong one.

Mr. De Tavarra, another Spanish journalist, stated that for some time public opinion had been drifting, and that at a very rapid rate, to the calling in of Alfonso as King. One of the principal things which had precipitated the matter had been the Carlist war. The troops of the so-called Republic (for the Spanish Republic has occurred) in the Carlist war, were very numerous. Spain was not Carlist. Half the officers in the Carlist army were at heart Alfonsoists. They might have fought well for the Republic, if a genuine republic had been established in the beginning, without the troubles and defects which embarrassed it. He believed that when the Duke de la Torre (Serrano) went North he was at heart an Alfonsoist, and anxious for the change. He had been told that the first effect would be to end the Carlist war. There are 200,000 Spanish troops and 100,000 Carlists in arms. The end of the war would mean 300,000 men to be disbanded, and relieve Spain of their support and of the other costs of the war. Then the Spanish Government can act more decisively. He believed it was within the possibilities that if the Administration at Washington did not change its tone at least a little, that the relations of Spain to the United States might come to the point of actual union. He did not believe that Spain, with a united and strong Government, would suffer what she had been obliged to endure when the executive power had no strength. He mentioned the instructions recently published by Secretary Fish to Mr. Cushing, the United States Minister to Madrid, giving him authority, he said, to intermeddle with Spanish internal affairs, dealing with the public men and the clubs. Gen. Sickles, the late Minister, attended and took part in the clubs and the societies for the emancipation of slaves and the freedom of Cuba. That was hardly the way a foreign representative should act in the country to which he is accredited as Minister. The American Government had insisted on the recall of Cateaux, the Russian Minister, because he privately aided on members of Congress the continuation of the duty on hemp. It could

A REPUBLICAN INDIGNANT.

THE REPORTED CHANGE A MISFORTUNE TO THE COUNTRY.

J. B. Martinez stated that the news had been entirely unexpected and startling to himself and most other Spanish men of business. Indeed he was very much inclined to disbelieve it yet. It came by way of Paris, and all Spanish news from that source was open to suspicion. It was incredible that a Government should be so swiftly organized, unless the whole country was rotten. The Carlist war was no cause for such a change. It was a war that from the nature of the ground, the roughness of the Pyrenees and northern mountains, would be protracted in any case. One or two of the new Cabinet, if it were a real Cabinet, he knew to be intelligent men, but scoundrels. The people of Spain never expected to see the son of Isabella back. They had had two years' training in republicanism, but if this news were true it might be long before they would have another chance. He doubted that the new Government would be established without more fighting. He did not suppose that the change would effect business or the international relations of Spain. He thought that the majority of Spaniards in this city, excluding some very rich men who were monarchists, were republicans, and to them this news was as great a blow as to him.

NO RELIEF FOR CUBA.

THE CUBANS EXPECT NO CHANGE OF POLICY TOWARD THE ISLAND, BUT HOPE FOR AMERICAN INTERFERENCE—A GENERAL EUROPEAN WAR PREDICTED.

The effect of the news of the change of the Spanish Government from a republic to a monarchy was very apparent yesterday among the Cubans, many believing that it would be for the benefit of the cause of independence in Cuba. José Manuel Mestre, who has been very deeply engaged in Cuban matters, said that he considered the news as nothing more than a change in the Spanish character. They were too far behind the age to be able to govern themselves, and any adventurer who has force of character enough might lead them for a time. As to the effect of the change of Government on Cuba, he thought that if there was any logic in acts, and the words of American rulers meant what they say, then the United States must help the Cubans. The President's message over a year ago intimated that the United States did not go to war with Spain on the Virginia question because it was a young Republic, and the policy of the American Government was to give encouragement to all young republics. Allowing this to be the meaning of the words, upon this same basis the United States should now do her best to aid Cuba in her struggles for political independence, and especially to secure freedom for the slaves. He did not know what the Cuban representatives in New-York would do, but thought that at present no very active measures would be adopted.

Another prominent Cuban said the result was nothing more than what he had expected. He had prophesied two years ago, when he returned from his visit to Europe. At that time Mr. Adams said he would give the Republic two years to live, and, strange enough, it had lived for two years to the very day and no more, it being on New Year's Day of 1873 when he made that remark. The result, so far as the condition of Cuba was concerned, would be the same; no matter what Government in Spain held the ruling power. The war for independence began under Isabella. When she was deposed, Spain continued to make war on those who were fighting for freedom. Spain subsequently became a kind of Dictator, and he made war on the Cubans. Another Cuban was chosen King, and he, too, fought against Cuban independence. The Republic made matters no better for Cuba, so far as the prospect of Cubans gaining their freedom was concerned; and King Alfonso will have to fight to clear up the difficulty. The Cubans will have to fight for their freedom still; the only thing possible to be gained is that the United States may now give them encouragement, whereas under the Republic it was against the declared policy of the Washington Cabinet.

Before Francisco V. Acuña said the news from Spain was "good," but declined to converse on the subject as to the effect it might have on Cuban affairs.

Another prominent Cuban said he thought the revolution in Spain would lead to a general European war, as being entirely opposed to the well-known policy of Prince Bismarck and the Italian Government. The cable dispatch says that "Alfonso had telegraphed to the Pope, asking his blessing, and promising that he will, like his ancestors, defend the rights of the Holy See." If this alludes to the temporal power of the Pope, Bismarck will certainly oppose the establishment of any new Government claiming that as a basis. Napoleon is evidently desirous to get back France as an empire. Spain, established as a monarchy under papal influence, would be a good ally, and the two would be a constant threat to Germany. It would therefore not be surprising to find Germany now giving its aid to the Carlists in order to fight the Alfonsoists, notwithstanding the fact that heretofore Germany appeared to be opposing the Carlists. The complications that will arise from the change in the form of the Spanish Government must certainly be advantageous to the German cause, for the Spanish Government will hardly be able to send away a single soldier for service in Cuba if there should appear to it that it might have to fight the Carlists in Spain. The South American republics had been, and were still, inclined to show their good feeling toward Cuban independence. First having already acknowledged Cuba, and Enrique Pizarro having been dispatched recently to Cuba as a diplomatic agent. On his way he will call on the Cuban Minister in Paris. At present the news of the return in Spain is likely to reach South America before him, and may operate on public feeling in his favor even before he arrives at Paris.

GENERAL FOREIGN NEWS.

RIGHT OF BURIAL IN CANADA.

ANOTHER REFUSAL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY TO PERMIT A BURIAL IN CONSECRATED GROUND.

MONTREAL, Canada, Jan. 1.—Another case, similar to the Gubord litigation, is likely to arise out of the refusal of the Roman Catholic clergy to bury the remains of a late victim of murder, Augustin Paradis, at St. Marie, in consecrated ground. The remains are interred for the present in an unconsecrated portion of the cemetery.

STORMS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

LONDON, Friday, Jan. 1, 1875. Snow fell at some places in the south of England to-day.

A heavy gale is blowing around the coasts of the United Kingdom to-day.

LABOR STRIKE IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, Friday, Jan. 1, 1875. The planers, riveters, and boiler-makers at Hull have struck work on account of a reduction of ten per cent on their wages.

CANADIAN NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

OTTAWA, Canada, Jan. 1.—The postal authorities contemn the creation of a system by which newspapers directed from the offices of publication will, in cities where the free-delivery system is in force, be distributed to regular subscribers without charge. A portion of the scheme is to establish a rate of newspaper postage which will be merely nominal, so that a small, light newspaper will be at no disadvantage as compared with large and heavy ones, and that this privilege will extend to newspapers going to the United States.

FOREIGN NOTES.

LONDON, Jan. 1.—The amount of bullion going into the Bank of England on balance to-day was £17,000.

HAVANA, Jan. 1.—The steamship Nile, from Southampton, arrived at Barbados D. C. 23 when a fire in her hold. Her cargo had suffered much damage.

A MISSISSIPPI STEAMER SUNK.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., Jan. 1.—A special to the *Appeal* from Helena, to-day, says the steamer *John B. Maude* struck an old sunken barge last evening about midnight while near or at what is known as O. K. Landing, 40 miles above Helena, and sank in about 23

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE CLERGY. BISHOP COLenso PREVENTED FROM PREACHING BY A THREAT OF INHIBITION—DISSATISFACTION WITH THE COURSE OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON—MR. TEMPLE WEST'S STORY ABOUT MR. GLADSTONE—MR. WEST CHARGED WITH INVENTING IT BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.] LONDON, Dec. 16.—Bishop Colenso was announced to preach on Sunday at St. James Chapel in York-st., out of St. James Square. This is one of those churches to which strangers, as well as a large regular congregation, are much in the habit of resorting, drawn by the fame of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, one of the most eloquent and most liberal clergymen in the Church of England. To hear Bishop Colenso there came a greater crowd than usual. I don't know whether the Bishop preached popular sermons, but of his own great personal popularity there can be no doubt. The bitterness with which he is pursued by the more bigoted churchmen is enough to account for that. There was a hope that he would have been asked by Dean Stanley to preach at Westminster Abbey. If he had been, that venerable fabric would have seen one of its greatest throngs. St. James Chapel is not large, and hundreds were turned away; other hundreds filled the aisles and stairs. But those who got in were as far from hearing Bishop Colenso as those who were kept out. He did not preach, and Mr. Brooke explained to the congregation why he did not. Late on Saturday evening he had received, he said, a letter from the Bishop of London. The Bishop of London stated that he had seen the advertisement that the Bishop of Natal would preach next day at Mr. Brooke's chapel, and he hoped the matter would be given up quietly. Otherwise he should have to ask his secretary to prepare an inhibition, and inhibit the Bishop of Natal from preaching. Mr. Brooke replied that he regretted that the Bishop of London should feel obliged to take such a step, and told his congregation that, in the circumstances, he could only submit. He went on to say that, in his opinion, the Bishop of London had acted with great courtesy, "for he might have inhibited the Bishop of Natal at the door of this church." It may be doubted whether his congregation shared their pastor's high opinion of the Bishop of London's courtesy. They responded to the statement, say the reports, by an outburst of indignant feeling, such as is not often witnessed in any place of worship, and which in this instance took the form of deliberate and loud hissing. After which Mr. Brooke delivered a sermon to which his audience listened in a frame of mind which may be imagined.

The hissing was meant, of course, for the Bishop of London. It was the readiest means of indicating an appreciation of the intolerance shown by his Lordship. Mr. Brooke, it is thought, might have shown more firmness. It is very strongly affirmed that the Bishop has no legal authority to issue an inhibition of the kind he threatened, or, at least, that such an inhibition would have no legal force, and that a clergyman disregarding it would incur no legal penalty. If this view be correct, there can be no reason why Mr. Brooke should have felt bound to obey an inhibition from the policy of which he obviously disented. Still less need he have come down before the shot was actually fired. Whether an inhibition has any legal validity or not, it is certain that a letter announcing an intention to issue one cannot have. The Bishop of London carried the day too easily so far as Mr. Brooke and the sermon of last Sunday are concerned. But I am slow to believe that the Bishop of Natal can really be prevented from preaching in London, if he wishes to preach in London. There seems to be some doubt whether he himself cares for a conflict with the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. It is stated that, in consequence of the threat of inhibition, he declines an invitation to preach in the church of the Rev. Dr. Hare's next Sunday. Even should this be so, there can be no reason for calling in question the courage of the stout old Bishop. He has proved it in one of the most protracted and apparently desperate contests ever waged in the Church.

The Bishop of London sought to soften the asperity of his act by expressing, almost with fervor, "a sympathy with the efforts of the Bishop of Natal to bring about justice in the colony over which he was Bishop." To which the Bishop of Natal replied in a letter to a friend, from which an extract is published: "The Bishop of London cannot see that, whatever I have done in this matter worthy of his sympathy, it is done in the name of Christianity, not of the Church. The Churches—which has compelled me to do it? Well, if there were more Bishops of Natal and fewer Bishops of London, the difference between the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the Churches might not be so striking.

Of late, however, the Bishops, to do them justice, have been more anxious to do them justice, with some surprise, devoting frequent paragraphs to them. Two of them have come forward—quitting for the moment the conclusion of their episcopal palaces to face the glare of daylight in a newspaper—to contradict Mr. Temple West's pleasant story about their interview with Mr. Gladstone touching the Public Worship Bill last session. As this story which I gave in a recent letter represented Mr. Gladstone as declaring himself free on the disestablishment question, it was from Mr. Gladstone that a denial might naturally have been looked for. If Mr. Gladstone had really made so portentous an announcement to the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, there would have been nothing to wonder at in their telegraphing to their brother Bishops to come up and vote against a clause which was to have the result of raising Mr. Gladstone's hand against the Church. There was, however, another tag to the story, to the effect: "I am now learning from the Bishop of Winchester himself—that one Bishop had sent word he had a private party and could not come. I think it is the Bishop of Winchester. He publishes a letter contradicting a part of the story. His letter is so worded that it is difficult to make out how much he means to deny. All that he does in fact deny is the statement that he and the Bishop of Ely telegraphed to their colleagues to vote against a particular clause because disestablishment was touched by it, and that one Bishop replied as above. Did, then, Mr. Gladstone say what he is reported to have said, and did the Bishops telegraph, but for a different reason? The Bishop of Winchester leaves much to conjecture, but not the fact that he is very angry with Mr. Temple West, for he goes out of his episcopal way to suggest that Mr. Temple West "invented" the statement which the Bishop contradicts.

I find, furthermore, a report of two sermons by the Bishop of Manchester which deserve remark. With them I shall complete my letter, and then the most exacting Bishop will no longer have a right to say that his order has not had a fair share of attention. For I shall have occupied a whole letter with Bishop of Manchester's, if I mistake not, the same prelate who, not so very long ago, proposed—as a remedy for existing agricultural discontent—to duck Mr. Joseph Arch in a horse-pond. The plan was never tried, and the Bishop has since said many much more sensible things. His sermons on Sunday showed that what is called a tendency of the times has made itself felt even among Bishops. There is a tendency in preachers to become more practical. It is only in Scotland that congregations insist on regular doctrinal expositions. The Bishop was swimming with the stream when he took two lately published books as a text. He recommended his hearers to read "Greville's Memoirs" and Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort" together. The two books show, thinks the Bishop, that this generation is better than the last—or, perhaps I should say, that

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE CLERGY. BISHOP COLenso PREVENTED FROM PREACHING BY A THREAT OF INHIBITION—DISSATISFACTION WITH THE COURSE OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON—MR. TEMPLE WEST'S STORY ABOUT MR. GLADSTONE—MR. WEST CHARGED WITH INVENTING IT BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.] LONDON, Dec. 16.—Bishop Colenso was announced to preach on Sunday at St. James Chapel in York-st., out of St. James Square. This is one of those churches to which strangers, as well as a large regular congregation, are much in the habit of resorting, drawn by the fame of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, one of the most eloquent and most liberal clergymen in the Church of England. To hear Bishop Colenso there came a greater crowd than usual. I don't know whether the Bishop preached popular sermons, but of his own great personal popularity there can be no doubt. The bitterness with which he is pursued by the more bigoted churchmen is enough to account for that. There was a hope that he would have been asked by Dean Stanley to preach at Westminster Abbey. If he had been, that venerable fabric would have seen one of its greatest throngs. St. James Chapel is not large, and hundreds were turned away; other hundreds filled the aisles and stairs. But those who got in were as far from hearing Bishop Colenso as those who were kept out. He did not preach, and Mr. Brooke explained to the congregation why he did not. Late on Saturday evening he had received, he said, a letter from the Bishop of London. The Bishop of London stated that he had seen the advertisement that the Bishop of Natal would preach next day at Mr. Brooke's chapel, and he hoped the matter would be given up quietly. Otherwise he should have to ask his secretary to prepare an inhibition, and inhibit the Bishop of Natal from preaching. Mr. Brooke replied that he regretted that the Bishop of London should feel obliged to take such a step, and told his congregation that, in the circumstances, he could only submit. He went on to say that, in his opinion, the Bishop of London had acted with great courtesy, "for he might have inhibited the Bishop of Natal at the door of this church." It may be doubted whether his congregation shared their pastor's high opinion of the Bishop of London's courtesy. They responded to the statement, say the reports, by an outburst of indignant feeling, such as is not often witnessed in any place of worship, and which in this instance took the form of deliberate and loud hissing. After which Mr. Brooke delivered a sermon to which his audience listened in a frame of mind which may be imagined.

The hissing was meant, of course, for the Bishop of London. It was the readiest means of indicating an appreciation of the intolerance shown by his Lordship. Mr. Brooke, it is thought, might have shown more firmness. It is very strongly affirmed that the Bishop has no legal authority to issue an inhibition of the kind he threatened, or, at least, that such an inhibition would have no legal force, and that a clergyman disregarding it would incur no legal penalty. If this view be correct, there can be no reason why Mr. Brooke should have felt bound to obey an inhibition from the policy of which he obviously disented. Still less need he have come down before the shot was actually fired. Whether an inhibition has any legal validity or not, it is certain that a letter announcing an intention to issue one cannot have. The Bishop of London carried the day too easily so far as Mr. Brooke and the sermon of last Sunday are concerned. But I am slow to believe that the Bishop of Natal can really be prevented from preaching in London, if he wishes to preach in London. There seems to be some doubt whether he himself cares for a conflict with the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. It is stated that, in consequence of the threat of inhibition, he declines an invitation to preach in the church of the Rev. Dr. Hare's next Sunday. Even should this be so, there can be no reason for calling in question the courage of the stout old Bishop. He has proved it in one of the most protracted and apparently desperate contests ever waged in the Church.

The Bishop of London sought to soften the asperity of his act by expressing, almost with fervor, "a sympathy with the efforts of the Bishop of Natal to bring about justice in the colony over which he was Bishop." To which the Bishop of Natal replied in a letter to a friend, from which an extract is published: "The Bishop of London cannot see that, whatever I have done in this matter worthy of his sympathy, it is done in the name of Christianity, not of the Church. The Churches—which has compelled me to do it? Well, if there were more Bishops of Natal and fewer Bishops of London, the difference between the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the Churches might not be so striking.

Of late, however, the Bishops, to do them justice, have been more anxious to do them justice, with some surprise, devoting frequent paragraphs to them. Two of them have come forward—quitting for the moment the conclusion of their episcopal palaces to face the glare of daylight in a newspaper—to contradict Mr. Temple West's pleasant story about their interview with Mr. Gladstone touching the Public Worship Bill last session. As this story which I gave in a recent letter represented Mr. Gladstone as declaring himself free on the disestablishment question, it was from Mr. Gladstone that a denial might naturally have been looked for. If Mr. Gladstone had really made so portentous an announcement to the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, there would have been nothing to wonder at in their telegraphing to their brother Bishops to come up and vote against a clause which was to have the result of raising Mr. Gladstone's hand against the Church. There was, however, another tag to the story, to the effect: "I am now learning from the Bishop of Winchester himself—that one Bishop had sent word he had a private party and could not come. I think it is the Bishop of Winchester. He publishes a letter contradicting a part of the story. His letter is so worded that it is difficult to make out how much he means to deny. All that he does in fact deny is the statement that he and the Bishop of Ely telegraphed to their colleagues to vote against a particular clause because disestablishment was touched by it, and that one Bishop replied as above. Did, then, Mr. Gladstone say what he is reported to have said, and did the Bishops telegraph, but for a different reason? The Bishop of Winchester leaves much to conjecture, but not the fact that he is very angry with Mr. Temple West, for he goes out of his episcopal way to suggest that Mr. Temple West "invented" the statement which the Bishop contradicts.

I find, furthermore, a report of two sermons by the Bishop of Manchester which deserve remark. With them I shall complete my letter, and then the most exacting Bishop will no longer have a right to say that his order has not had a fair share of attention. For I shall have occupied a whole letter with Bishop of Manchester's, if I mistake not, the same prelate who, not so very long ago, proposed—as a remedy for existing agricultural discontent—to duck Mr. Joseph Arch in a horse-pond. The plan was never tried, and the Bishop has since said many much more sensible things. His sermons on Sunday showed that what is called a tendency of the times has made itself felt even among Bishops. There is a tendency in preachers to become more practical. It is only in Scotland that congregations insist on regular doctrinal expositions. The Bishop was swimming with the stream when he took two lately published books as a text. He recommended his hearers to read "Greville's Memoirs" and Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort" together. The two books show, thinks the Bishop, that this generation is better than the last—or, perhaps I should say, that

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE CLERGY. BISHOP COLenso PREVENTED FROM PREACHING BY A THREAT OF INHIBITION—DISSATISFACTION WITH THE COURSE OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON—MR. TEMPLE WEST'S STORY ABOUT MR. GLADSTONE—MR. WEST CHARGED WITH INVENTING IT BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.] LONDON, Dec. 16.—Bishop Colenso was announced to preach on Sunday at St. James Chapel in York-st., out of St. James Square. This is one of those churches to which strangers, as well as a large regular congregation, are much in the habit of resorting, drawn by the fame of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, one of the most eloquent and most liberal clergymen in the Church of England. To hear Bishop Colenso there came a greater crowd than usual. I don't know whether the Bishop preached popular sermons, but of his own great personal popularity there can be no doubt. The bitterness with which he is pursued by the more bigoted churchmen is enough to account for that. There was a hope that he would have been asked by Dean Stanley to preach at Westminster Abbey. If he had been, that venerable fabric would have seen one of its greatest throngs. St. James Chapel is not large, and hundreds were turned away; other hundreds filled the aisles and stairs. But those who got in were as far from hearing Bishop Colenso as those who were kept out. He did not preach, and Mr. Brooke explained to the congregation why he did not. Late on Saturday evening he had received, he said, a letter from the Bishop of London. The Bishop of London stated that he had seen the advertisement that the Bishop of Natal would preach next day at Mr. Brooke's chapel, and he hoped the matter would be given up quietly. Otherwise he should have to ask his secretary to prepare an inhibition, and inhibit the Bishop of Natal from preaching. Mr. Brooke replied that he regretted that the Bishop of London should feel obliged to take such a step, and told his congregation that, in the circumstances, he could only submit. He went on to say that, in his opinion, the Bishop of London had acted with great courtesy, "for he might have inhibited the Bishop of Natal at the door of this church." It may be doubted whether his congregation shared their pastor's high opinion of the Bishop of London's courtesy. They responded to the statement, say the reports, by an outburst of indignant feeling, such as is not often witnessed in any place of worship, and which in this instance took the form of deliberate and loud hissing. After which Mr. Brooke delivered a sermon to which his audience listened in a frame of mind which may be imagined.

The hissing was meant, of course, for the Bishop of London. It was the readiest means of indicating an appreciation of the intolerance shown by his Lordship. Mr. Brooke, it is thought, might have shown more firmness. It is very strongly affirmed that the Bishop has no legal authority to issue an inhibition of the kind he threatened, or, at least, that such an inhibition would have no legal force, and that a clergyman disregarding it would incur no legal penalty. If this view be correct, there can be no reason why Mr. Brooke should have felt bound to obey an inhibition from the policy of which he obviously disented. Still less need he have come down before the shot was actually fired. Whether an inhibition has any legal validity or not, it is certain that a letter announcing an intention to issue one cannot have. The Bishop of London carried the day too easily so far as Mr. Brooke and the sermon of last Sunday are concerned. But I am slow to believe that the Bishop of Natal can really be prevented from preaching in London, if he wishes to preach in London. There seems to be some doubt whether he himself cares for a conflict with the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. It is stated that, in consequence of the threat of inhibition, he declines an invitation to preach in the church of the Rev. Dr. Hare's next Sunday. Even should this be so, there can be no reason for calling in question the courage of the stout old Bishop. He has proved it in one of the most protracted and apparently desperate contests ever waged in the Church.

The Bishop of London sought to soften the asperity of his act by expressing, almost with fervor, "a sympathy with the efforts of the Bishop of Natal to bring about justice in the colony over which he was Bishop." To which the Bishop of Natal replied in a letter to a friend, from which an extract is published: "The Bishop of London cannot see that, whatever I have done in this matter worthy of his sympathy, it is done in the name of Christianity, not of the Church. The Churches—which has compelled me to do it? Well, if there were more Bishops of Natal and fewer Bishops of London, the difference between the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the Churches might not be so striking.

Of late, however, the Bishops, to do them justice, have been more anxious to do them justice, with some surprise, devoting frequent paragraphs to them. Two of them have come forward—quitting for the moment the conclusion of their episcopal palaces to face the glare of daylight in a newspaper—to contradict Mr. Temple West's pleasant story about their interview with Mr. Gladstone touching the Public Worship Bill last session. As this story which I gave in a recent letter represented Mr. Gladstone as declaring himself free on the disestablishment question, it was from Mr. Gladstone that a denial might naturally have been looked for. If Mr. Gladstone had really made so portentous an announcement to the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, there would have been nothing to wonder at in their telegraphing to their brother Bishops to come up and vote against a clause which was to have the result of raising Mr. Gladstone's hand against the Church. There was, however, another tag to the story, to the effect: "I am now learning from the Bishop of Winchester himself—that one Bishop had sent word he had a private party and could not come. I think it is the Bishop of Winchester. He publishes a letter contradicting a part of the story. His letter is so worded that it is difficult to make out how much he means to deny. All that he does in fact deny is the statement that he and the Bishop of Ely telegraphed to their colleagues to vote against a particular clause because disestablishment was touched by it, and that one Bishop replied as above. Did, then, Mr. Gladstone say what he is reported to have said, and did the Bishops telegraph, but for a different reason? The Bishop of Winchester leaves much to conjecture, but not the fact that he is very angry with Mr. Temple West, for he goes out of his episcopal way to suggest that Mr. Temple West "invented" the statement which the Bishop contradicts.

I find, furthermore, a report of two sermons by the Bishop of Manchester which deserve remark. With them I shall complete my letter, and then the most exacting Bishop will no longer have a right to say that his order has not had a fair share of attention. For I shall have occupied a whole letter with Bishop of Manchester's, if I mistake not, the same prelate who, not so very long ago, proposed—as a remedy for existing agricultural discontent—to duck Mr. Joseph Arch in a horse-pond. The plan was never tried, and the Bishop has since said many much more sensible things. His sermons on Sunday showed that what is called a tendency of the times has made itself felt even among Bishops. There is a tendency in preachers to become more practical. It is only in Scotland that congregations insist on regular doctrinal expositions. The Bishop was swimming with the stream when he took two lately published books as a text. He recommended his hearers to read "Greville's Memoirs" and Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort" together. The two books show, thinks the Bishop, that this generation is better than the last—or, perhaps I should say, that

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DISSENSIONS AMONG THE CLERGY. BISHOP COLenso PREVENTED FROM PREACHING BY A THREAT OF INHIBITION—DISSATISFACTION WITH THE COURSE OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON—MR. TEMPLE WEST'S STORY ABOUT MR. GLADSTONE—MR. WEST CHARGED WITH INVENTING IT BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.] LONDON, Dec. 16.—Bishop Colenso was announced to preach on Sunday at St. James Chapel in York-st., out of St. James Square. This is one of those churches to which strangers, as well as a large regular congregation, are much in the habit of resorting, drawn by the fame of the Rev. Stopford Brooke, one of the most eloquent and most liberal clergymen in the Church of England. To hear Bishop Colenso there came a greater crowd than usual. I don't know whether the Bishop preached popular sermons, but of his own great personal popularity there can be no doubt. The bitterness with which he is pursued by the more bigoted churchmen is enough to account for that. There was a hope that he would have been asked by Dean Stanley to preach at Westminster Abbey. If he had been, that venerable fabric would have seen one of its greatest throngs. St. James Chapel is not large, and hundreds were turned away; other hundreds filled the aisles and stairs. But those who got in were as far from hearing Bishop Colenso as those who were kept out. He did not preach, and Mr. Brooke explained to the congregation why he did not. Late on Saturday evening he had received, he said, a letter from the Bishop of London. The Bishop of London stated that he had seen the advertisement that the Bishop of Natal would preach next day at Mr. Brooke's chapel, and he hoped the matter would be given up quietly. Otherwise he should have to ask his secretary to prepare an inhibition, and inhibit the Bishop of Natal from preaching. Mr. Brooke replied that he regretted that the Bishop of London should feel obliged to take such a step, and told his congregation that, in the circumstances, he could only submit. He went on to say that, in his opinion, the Bishop of London had acted with great courtesy, "for he might have inhibited the Bishop of Natal at the door of this church." It may be doubted whether his congregation shared their pastor's high opinion of the Bishop of London's courtesy. They responded to the statement, say the reports, by an outburst of indignant feeling, such as is not often witnessed in any place of worship, and which in this instance took the form of deliberate and loud hissing. After which Mr. Brooke delivered a sermon to which his audience listened in a frame of mind which may be imagined.

The hissing was meant, of course, for the Bishop of London. It was the readiest means of indicating an appreciation of the intolerance shown by his Lordship. Mr. Brooke, it is thought, might have shown more firmness. It is very strongly affirmed that the Bishop has no legal authority to issue an inhibition of the kind he threatened, or, at least, that such an inhibition would have no legal force, and that a clergyman disregarding it would incur no legal penalty. If this view be correct, there can be no reason why Mr. Brooke should have felt bound to obey an inhibition from the policy of which he obviously disented. Still less need he have come down before the shot was actually fired. Whether an inhibition has any legal validity or not, it is certain that a letter announcing an intention to issue one cannot have. The Bishop of London carried the day too easily so far as Mr. Brooke and the sermon of last Sunday are concerned. But I am slow to believe that the Bishop of Natal can really be prevented from preaching in London, if he wishes to preach in London. There seems to be some doubt whether he himself cares for a conflict with the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese. It is stated that, in consequence of the threat of inhibition, he declines an invitation to preach in the church of the Rev. Dr. Hare's next Sunday. Even should this be so, there can be no reason for calling in question the courage of the stout old Bishop. He has proved it in one of the most protracted and apparently desperate contests ever waged in the Church.

The Bishop of London sought to soften the asperity of his act by expressing, almost with fervor, "a sympathy with the efforts of the Bishop of Natal to bring about justice in the colony over which he was Bishop." To which the Bishop of Natal replied in a letter to a friend, from which an extract is published: "The Bishop of London cannot see that, whatever I have done in this matter worthy of his sympathy, it is done in the name of Christianity, not of the Church. The Churches—which has compelled me to do it? Well, if there were more Bishops of Natal and fewer Bishops of London, the difference between the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of the Churches might not be so striking.

Of late, however, the Bishops, to do them justice, have been more anxious to do them justice, with some surprise, devoting frequent paragraphs to them. Two of them have come forward—quitting for the moment the conclusion of their episcopal palaces to face the glare of daylight in a newspaper—to contradict Mr. Temple West's pleasant story about their interview with Mr. Gladstone touching the Public Worship Bill last session. As this story which I gave in a recent letter represented Mr. Gladstone as declaring himself free on the disestablishment question, it was from Mr. Gladstone that a denial might naturally have been looked for. If Mr. Gladstone had really made so portentous an announcement to the Bishops of